



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,664	08/05/2003	Young-Eil Kim	Q76234	5307

7590 05/03/2004

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS. PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-3202

EXAMINER

DINH, TRINH VO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2821

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/633,664

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Trinh Vo Dinh

Art Unit

2821

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-7 and 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,7 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/794,959.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/19/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

In claim 6, the limitation "a tip" finds no support in the specification." Therefore, the specification should be amended including a support for the limitation.

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "a position with the tip not protruding above said cover member" in claim 6 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 2821

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1, 6 and 9 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 and 4 (or claim 7) respectively of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,236 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed language "a computer with a computer display" recited in claim 1 of the instant application is similar to the limitation "a computer" in claim 1 of the U.S. No. 6,628,236 B2 because any computer must have a computer display for display computer information.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kudoh (USP 6,295,462 B1).

Kudoh discloses, in Figs.1-6, a computer having a computer main body (1), cover member (2) closely installed at the computer main body, with a computer display (5) for displaying an image, a first antenna (7), a second antenna (9, 22), an RF circuit module (12), and a switch (16), the first antenna being mounted on said cover member (2), the second antenna

Art Unit: 2821

being mounted on the computer at one of the cover member and the main body, and the switch selectively switching at least one of the first and second antennas to operably connect to the RF circuit module based on an opening state of the cover member (2) of the computer with respect to the main body wherein electric wave are communicated by at least one of the first and the second antenna in any opening state of the cover member (Abstract, or col. 3, lines 35+, col. 4, line 38 to col. 5, line 14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kudoh view of Karidis et al (USP 5,684,672).

Kudoh discloses every feature of the claimed invention except the first antenna being a dipole and being movable from a position with a tip of the first antenna producing above the cover member to a position with the tip not producing above the cover member. Karidis discloses, in Figs. 4-5 and col. 2, lines 57-67) a first antenna (110) being movable from a position (in Fig. 5) with a tip of the first antenna protruding above a cover member (114) to a position (in Fig. 1) with the tip not protruding above the cover member. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at use Karidis's antenna for Kudoh's computer system because Karidis's antenna is a retractable antenna therefore, it would save space and reduce any risk of accidental break when the antenna is not in use. With respect to the

limitation “the first antenna is a dipole antenna”, although Kudoh and Karidis do not suggest the first antenna being a dipole, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have first antenna element being a dipole, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of a component. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

9. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kudoh view of Harano (US 2002/0013160 A1).

Kudoh discloses substantially the claimed invention as noted above in claim 1. Kudoh further discloses the second antenna (9) being a strip line. However, Kudoh does not suggest the second antenna being installed in the main body. Harano discloses, in Figs. 1 or 4 and paragraph [0043], [0066]-[0067], an antenna (4 or 34) being disposed in a main body (2). Since one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefit of minimizing the size and cost of the antenna device, it would have been obvious to locate Kudoh’ antenna in the main body of the computer as taught by Harano.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The cited art of record fails to teach the isotropic antenna system comprising a switch button capable of elastically protruding or retreating as the cover member is open or closed so that the first antenna or the second antenna is connected to the switch.

Inquiry

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trinh Vo Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-1821. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong, can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art unit 2821

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Trinh Vo Dinh', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

*Trinh Vo Dinh
April 23, 2004*